

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending in the above-identified application. In the April 5, 2000 Office Action the Examiner rejected Claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over Butler et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,018,340).

Claim 1 is an independent method claim and Claims 7 and 13 are independent apparatus claims in the present application. Independent Claim 1 is for a method for supporting multiple displays for a drawing surface. In a first step capability parameters are received regarding a first display of multiple displays. In a second step, selected display capabilities are substituted for the capability parameters. Finally in the third step the selected display capabilities are provided to an operating system. Independent Claim 7 is a corresponding apparatus claim for a multiple display supporting module that has a processing module and a memory operably coupled to the processing module. The memory includes operational instructions that cause the processing module to operate according to the method set forth in Claim 1. Claim 13 is directed to a digital storage medium for storing operation instructions that cause a processing module to support multiple displays associated with the drawing surface. First, second and third storage mediums implement the method as set forth in Claim 1. The Examiner has rejected each of the claims in view of Butler et al. under 35 U.S.C. 102. The Examiner, for example, in his arguments regarding Claim 1, states that Butler et al. teaches a method for supporting multiple displays for a drawing surface in Col. 4, ll. 24-25. The Examiner further alleges that in Col. 17, ll. 2-33 it is taught the step of receiving capability parameters regarding a first display of the multiple displays, Col. 10, ll. 38-53 it is taught the step of substituting selected capabilities for the capability parameters, and Col. 5, ll. 19-29 it is taught the step of providing the selected display capabilities to an operating system.

U.S. Patent No. 6,018,340 issued to Butler et al. discloses a display management system in a multiple monitor environment. In the Butler et al. computer system an operating system has a graphic user interface, a user subsystem which together with the

graphic user interface provides for managing a plurality of applications, and a graphical device interface for routing the graphical user interface information relating to the applications. First and second device drivers receive the graphical user interface information routed from a graphical device interface and a forking display driver. The forking display driver is used for implementing a method which allocates the display of the graphical user information. This information is allocated to only one monitor, where two or more monitors are controlled by the operating system in a manner so as to find a virtual monitor space that is formed by the combined monitor space of each of the separate monitors. In regards to the step of substituting selected display capabilities for the capability parameters, the Examiner has referenced Col. 10, ll. 38-53 of Butler et al. Here, Butler et al. teaches an alternative method that calculates a respective distance from a clipped point to each of the monitor spaces using only subtractive operations. Butler et al. is concerned about a monitor space 41. It is not clear how this teaching of Butler et al. renders unpatentable the claimed invention of the present application as set forth in each of the independent claims. Under a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 each element of the claimed invention as set forth in the claims must be identified in the cited prior art. This does not appear to be the case for the cited prior art of Butler et al.

In order to more clearly define Applicant's invention, Applicant has amended each of the independent claims to further state, for example in Claim 1, that the selected display capabilities exceed display capabilities of each of the multiple displays. In the Specification as originally filed, on page 6, ll. 11-15, it specifically states that the selected display capabilities include display parameters that exceed the display capabilities of each of the multiple displays coupled to the computing system. Butler et al. does not teach or suggest providing such substitute selected display capabilities.

Therefore, with the amended claims and for the reasons set forth above, Applicant believes that the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 102 has been overcome. The

Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to reconsider the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 102.

The prior art made a record and not relied upon is considered to be of general interest only. This application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action at an early date is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

MARKISON & RECKAMP, P.C.

By



John R. Garrett

Registration No 27,888

8/1/00

MARKISON & RECKAMP, P.C.
P.O. Box 06229, Wacker Drive
Chicago, IL 60606-0229
(312) 939-9800
FAX (312) 939-9828